

## **REMARKS**

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated April 21, 2008, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on July 21, 2008. Claims 12 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 1 and 13, to which claims 12 and 21 depend, have been amended to include the limitations recited in claims 12 and 21, thereby putting claims 1 and 13 in condition for allowance. Claims 12, 21 and 22-41 have been cancelled without prejudice. New claims 42-45 have been added to more clearly recite aspects of the invention. Support for those claims may be found throughout the specification, including paragraph [0026]. Applicants believe no new matter has been introduced by the amendments and the new claims presented herein. The amendments and the new claims have been presented herein to put the claims in condition for allowance or in better condition for an appeal. Applicants reserve the right to subsequently take up prosecution of the claims as originally filed in this application in a continuation, a continuation-in-part and/or a divisional application. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-11 and 13-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In particular, the Examiner takes the position that the limitation "applying a three dimensional operator to the convolutions" in claims 1 and 13 do not apprise one of ordinary skill in the art as to which three dimensional operator applied to the convolutions would constitute patent infringement. Claims 1 and 13 have been amended to include "wherein the three dimensional operator is a three dimensional demigration operator having an offset equal to half the first nominal offset and a velocity equal to one of half the water velocity or half of a multiple velocity function," which were previously recited in claims 12 and 21. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 21 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 1 and 13, to which

claims 12 and 21 depend, have been amended to include the limitations previously recited in claims 12 and 21. Accordingly, claims 1 and 13 are now in condition for allowance. Claims 2-11 and 14-20 are also in condition for allowance since they depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively.

New claims 42-45 have been added to more clearly recite certain aspects of the invention. Support for those claims can be found throughout the specification, including paragraph [0026]. Applicants submit that claims 42-45 recite subject matter that is neither disclosed, taught, nor otherwise suggested by the cited references, and as such, allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, neither alone nor in combination, teach, show, or suggest the claimed invention. Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

The prior art made of record is noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicants' disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, it is believed that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not deemed necessary for a full and complete response to this office action. Accordingly, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ari Pramudji/ Date: July 21, 2008

Ari Pramudji

Registration No. 45,022

PRAMUDJI WENDT & TRAN, LLP

1800 Bering, Suite 540

Houston, Texas 77057

Telephone: (713) 468-4600

Facsimile: (713) 980-9882

Attorney for Assignee